REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Claims 5-8 have been added. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by **Walsh** (U.S. Patent 5,952,943); and claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walsh** in view of **Vetro** (U.S. Patent 6,519,288). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Walsh discloses video signal image encoding schemes that take into account the rate at which the resulting encoding bitstream can or will be decoded. Walsh discloses tuning the encoding algorithm to generate encoded image data in an attempt to provide a high quality image while staying within the processing limits of the decoding system. (Col. 2, lines 40-56.)

The system in Walsh includes an encoding system 100 which transforms video data into six bands of data for each frame: four Y-component bands, one U-component band and one V-component band. The system has a decoding system 200 which applies decode processing to each band and inverse transform is applied to the four decoded Y-component bands to generate a decoded Y-component plane. The Y-component plane data are processed with the decoded U- and V-component plane data to generate a decoded video image for display.

Applicant respectfully submits that Walsh does not disclose a controller for controlling a decoding amount by said decoder" as recited in claim 1.

Walsh discloses that the encode rate is adjusted based on the processing capabilities of the decoder. (Col. 2, lines 40-56.) If the encoding system determines that the decoding system has additional processing capacity remaining after decoding the current version of the encoded data, then the encoding system can adjust encoding parameters to increase the quality of the decoded image data. (Col. 2, line 64 to col. 3, line 1.) However, Walsh does not disclose a controller which adjusts the decoding amount of the decoder.

The Office Action takes the position that Walsh discloses controlling a decoding amount by the decoder at col. 4, lines 32-54. (Office Action, page 2.) However, this passage merely states that the host processor 208 accesses encoded data and decodes the encoded video bitstream for display. The passage says nothing about controlling a decoding amount by the decoder. Therefore, Walsh does not disclose the elements as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference, and claims 2-4 are patentable by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 is hereby solicited.

New Claims

Claims 5-8 are newly added. According to new claim 5, a fetcher fetches a plurality of still images each of which has a plurality of encoded image components generated by encoding for each frequency component. A decoder decodes, in the order of a lower frequency, the plurality of encoded image components corresponding to a single still image fetched by the fetcher. A multiplexer multiplies with each other a plurality of decoded image components

decoded by the decoder so as to generate a single decoded still image. A reproducer reproduces a moving image based on the decoded still image generated by the multiplexer. A controller controls a decoding amount of the decoder based on a fetching period of the still image by the fetcher.

Thus, a plurality of encoded image components corresponding to a single still image are decoded by the decoder in the order of a lower frequency, and a decoding amount of the decoder is controlled by the controller based on a fetching period of the still image by the fetcher. Therefore, it is possible to reproduce a moving image at a designated frame rate.

Claim 8 recites a method with steps corresponding essentially with the functionality as described regarding claim 5.

Walsh discloses that if it is determined that a decoding system will have additional processing capacity remaining after decoding a current version of encoded data, then one or more of encoding parameters may be adjusted to increase quantity of decoded image data. However, Walsh fails to teach or suggest features of claim 5 or 8 in which a plurality of encoded image components corresponding to a single still image are decoded by the decoder; decoding in in the order of a lower frequency; controlling a decoding amount with a controller based on a fetching period of the still image in the fetcher. Therefore, Walsh does not disclose the elements as recited in claims 5-8.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Andrew G. Melick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,868
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adb